UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/790,931	03/01/2004	Takemori Takayama	04005/LH	3234	
	7590 06/10/200 OLTZ, GOODMAN &	EXAMINER			
220 Fifth Avenue 16TH Floor NEW YORK, NY 10001-7708			YEE, DEBORAH		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1793		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/10/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/790,931	TAKAYAMA ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Deborah Yee	1793		

	Deboran Yee	1793						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 14 May 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time								
periods:	of the Circles in the s							
 a) The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Among event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire lateral expired to the period for reply expired to the period for r	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	•						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL								
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
AMENDMENTS								
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor			cause					
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		E below);						
(c) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or								
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.						
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.17	16 and 41.33(a)).							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):								
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).								
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:								
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3-15,17-20 and 22</u> .								
Claim(s) rejected: 7,3-73,77-20 and 22. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a					
showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.								
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:					
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). <u>5/14/08 and 2/11/08</u>								
13. ☑ Other: additional IDS dated 4/2/07 and 8/30/07.								
	/Deborah Yee/ Primary Examiner							
	-							

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06) Art Unit: 1793

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendment "when the C content is 0.55 wt%, the Cr content is 0.3 wt% or more " clearly raises a new matter issue since Applicants' specification on page 18, lines 4-6 only shows support for one example wherein " the Cr concentration of the cementite of a steel containing 0.55 wt% C and 0.3 wt% Cr when heated to 700C is 2.6 wt%". There is no teaching that Cr can be more than 0.3 wt% when C content is 0.55 wt%.

The proposed amendment "when C content is 1.5 wt%, the Cr content is less than 1.8 wt%" clearly raises a new matter issue since Applicants' specification on page 20, lines 2-3 only shows support for "when C is 0.5 to 1.5%, the Cr content is 1.8 wt% or less". In addition, the proposed amendment wherein " Cr is less than 1.8 wt%" would be broader than the claimed Cr range of " 0.3 to 1.5%".

It should also be noted that claim 1 recites case-hardened layer with cementite containing "Cr solid dissolved therein" which is indefinite because the aim of present invention is to prevent Cr in cementite from dissolving. It is recommended to delete "solid dissolved".